

outstanding first responders and emergency management officials because, when times truly get tough, we rely on them to protect our loved ones, neighbors, and friends, and we rely on them to save lives.

This past week, a nearly unprecedented wave of frigid temperatures and snow bore down on the Hoosier State. In Madison County, Indiana, windchills plummeted to nearly 40 degrees below zero. In Hamilton County, Indiana, more than a foot of snow made roads unpassable. At one point, there were more than 70,000 power outages in our State, and schools actually still remain closed even today, for the entire week.

Fortunately, Hoosiers were able to rely on a coordinated and effective response from government officials, first responders, utility providers, and volunteers. They relied on our National Guard, which stepped up to assist in clearing roads. They relied on police officers and firefighters, who went door-to-door. They relied on the Red Cross, which set up numerous emergency shelters. In Indianapolis, they relied on the Mayor's Action Center, which took more than 10,000 calls to address their concerns.

It is times like these when we are reminded how much we rely on our emergency management people. We rely on them to be ready, and they always answer the call. For that, we are so grateful.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago, more than 1 million Americans lost access to unemployment insurance benefits. Another 3.5 million will be impacted if Congress doesn't act. American families will lose that tiny amount of money, that small amount of money that keeps food on the table for millions of Americans.

Has unemployment decreased? Well, it has decreased a bit. But unfortunately, unemployment is still too high for the people of the San Fernando Valley and many places around our country. Californians have already lost more than \$64 million in unemployment income just in this past week.

This is unacceptable. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of Americans struggling to buy food for their families; and, unfortunately, the budget that was passed recently did just that.

We must act now and pass an unemployment insurance extension bill immediately. We need to continue the opportunity for these millions of American families to be able to put food on the table. That is the America that we grew up in, and that is the America that we have to figure out how to keep going forward.

An extension of unemployment insurance occurred under President George

W. Bush, continues under President Obama, but this Congress needs to act to make sure we continue now.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AMIRI BARAKA

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor to honor the life and legacy of an icon, poet Amiri Baraka, who died yesterday in his hometown of Newark, New Jersey, at the age of 79.

Born during a time when racial tensions were at their peak, Amiri Baraka used poetry to empower and enlighten. He eventually founded the Black Arts Movement of the 1960s and '70s in Newark and around the country, and received countless awards for his contributions to the arts.

My father and he attended high school together, and I will never forget, as a youngster, hearing Amiri Baraka's poetry and recognizing the power his written words had over a person, regardless of race, age, or gender.

Amiri Baraka was not only a poet, he was an activist. In 1969, he organized the Black and Puerto Rican Convention, which brought those communities together at a time when it looked bleak. He also was one of the main organizers and the keynote speaker of the 1972 Black Political Convention in Gary, Indiana. His profound words were influential as many searched for meaning in some of the most troubling struggles of our time, like civil rights, war, oppression, and poverty.

My heartfelt condolences go out to the entire Baraka family, including my former colleague, Newark City Council Member Ras Baraka, and his brother Amiri Baraka, whom I have come very close to over the course of the past 4 or 5 years. To their mother, who has brought me in as almost a son as well, my deepest sympathy. I know where you are. I have been there just a short while ago. But let it be known, today the Nation is in deep mourning at his passing.

LIBERTY AND TYRANNY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes people say, Gee, if you are back here in Texas, you ought to be in Washington in session. I have to remind them that when we are in session, it is often the single biggest threat to American liberty, because when we are in session, we pass laws; and most every law, in some way, impacts people's liberty in one way or another, for good or for bad.

So often we think we know so much more here in Washington, that we can do so much better than others. And, of

course, that message is not helped by ignorance in the media, particularly left-wing and so many in the mainstream.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke a couple of days ago here about a real burden on my heart for women who are lured into ruts by promises of money by the Federal Government, lured into dependence, and how that is immoral for the government to do that. The government is not supposed to encourage or lure people into conduct that is not helpful to the individual. The government is supposed to be about encouraging good conduct. But if you do evil, then you should be afraid of the government because, as Romans says, God didn't give the sword to the government in vain.

That is the point, that we should not be about encouraging or paying people to engage in conduct that is hurtful to them. And yet ignorance in the left wing of our media is so pervasive that you could actually have people write stories saying I was up here blaming single moms. I mean, it is either ignorance or just complete dishonesty of people that want to destroy the very fabric and foundation of this country because of their ill will for all that is good and wholesome.

□ 1130

Why would they want to protect a system that lures people into dependency and prevents them from reaching their God-given potential? I realize some of them don't believe there is a God, and that is problematic because, since the Founders believed that we were endowed by a Creator with certain inalienable rights, among those life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, if you don't believe there is a Creator, it creates a problem, because then you have to think that government is the sole source of your rights, and if that is the case, you really have no rights.

C.S. Lewis pointed out after he went from being an atheist to being a believer in some God, some universal authority of right and wrong, if you don't believe that, then there can be no justice, no right and no wrong, if there is not a universal standard. So if it is relying on some government to establish what is right and not an innate sense instilled in us by some Higher Power, then there's no hope for most people of ever having rights, freedoms and liberties as we have had in this country.

It is plain that as we become more and more secular, there become fewer and fewer liberties and less and less privacy. Now especially, looking at ObamaCare, the government invades every room in the house. It used to be that our liberal friends here in the House complained repeatedly if they thought a Republican bill might, in some way, invade some room in the house. Yet without a single Republican vote, the Democrats passed through a law that invades every room in the house.

I am a big fan of Mark R. Levin, and I don't know that there is a better synopsis or there could be a better textbook for people to learn about our founding history than the book "Liberty and Tyranny." I guess the reason "Liberty and Tyranny" could never be a textbook for some government class would be that it costs less than \$20, and in order to be a textbook, some professor normally has to make 100, 200, \$300 a book, or it is not going to be utilized; or some leftwing source has to be the one providing the book and profiting, or it doesn't get used. "Liberty and Tyranny" has so many incredible jewels, as I have read from here on the floor numerous times.

In Mark's last book, there are things that we need to be reminded of that this brilliant—I don't know that anybody knows more about the history of the Supreme Court than Mark Levin, a brilliant man when it comes to our law, our Constitution, our Supreme Court—but he mentions in here, he draws so much from our history and throws it back in our faces so that we can't miss it, but Mark Levin points out the Nation has entered an age of post-constitutional, soft tyranny. Then he quotes from French thinker, philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville, as he explained presciently:

It covers the surface of a society with a network of small, complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered but softened, bent, and guided. Men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence. It does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes and stupefies a people until each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd.

I know, because some people don't like to be beat up by the left wing—as I apparently do—they don't want to be pointing these things out, and so I know that apparently we have got Republican staffers helping Senators who think that the things in this book are not worth spreading around the country. This is our history. If you don't learn your history, then how can you ever figure out the best way to go forward?

I am a big fan of the comments of Satchel Paige, an incredible baseball player. He came up with some great lines. I guess he is baseball's answer to Will Rogers. He is often quoted for saying, "don't look back, they may be gaining on you," but I have read that later in life he had a quote that I like even better. Satchel Paige reportedly said: "It is okay to look back, just don't stare."

Well, I majored in history. I think it is good to look back. As the old adage goes, "those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it." Some follow up and say that "those who do learn from history will find new ways to screw up," but that is another lesson.

Mark Levin goes on in "The Liberty Amendments" and said, de Tocqueville observed further:

It would seem as if the rulers of our time sought only to use men in order to make things great. I wish they would try a little more to make great men, that they would set less value on the work and more upon the workman, that they would never forget that a nation cannot long remain strong when every man belonging to it is individually weak, and that no form or combination of social polity has yet been devised to make an energetic people out of a community of pusillanimous and enfeebled citizens.

Today, Congress operates not as the Framers intended but in the shadows, where it dreams up its most notorious and oppressive laws, coming into the light only to trumpet the genius and earnestness of its goings on and to enable Members to cast their votes.

He goes on to say:

Congress also and often delegates unconstitutionally law-making power to a gigantic, ever growing administrative state that in turn unleashes on society myriad regulations and rules at such a rapid rate that people cannot possibly know of them either, and if by chance they do, they cannot possibly comprehend them. Nonetheless, ignorance which is widespread and deliberately so is no excuse for noncompliance for which the citizen is heavily fined and severely punished.

This is really a great synopsis of where we are. Congress thinks we know better, the President thinks he knows better, and some of this was started before the last Republican President left office with TARP. What a disaster. You can never achieve greatness if you do not have the same opportunity to fail. If the tightrope you are walking to achieve something extraordinary is sitting on the ground, then there is no risk, and there is nothing great achieved. Yet, this government wants to put such restrictions on people that they can never reach greatness. They can never reach as high as the grass might go.

I love this part in Mark Levin's book, and I realize it may bother not only the leftwing but some Republican Senate staffers. Mark Levin wrote:

Having delegated broad lawmaking power to executive branch departments and agencies of its own creation contravening the separation of powers doctrine, Congress now watches as the President inflates the congressional delegations even further and proclaims repeatedly the authority to rule by executive fiat in defiance of or over the top of the same Congress that sanctioned a domineering executive branch in the first place. Notwithstanding Congress' delinquency but because of it an unquenched President in a hurry to expedite a societal makeover has repeatedly admonished Congress that "if it won't act soon to protect future generations, I will."

That is, if Congress will not genuflect to his demands and pass laws to his liking, he will act on his own. And the President has made good on his refrain on a growing list of matters. He has, in fact, displayed an impressive aptitude for imperial rule with the help from a phalanx of policy czars from immigration, the environment, labor law to health care, welfare and energy. The President has excised his executive discretion to create new law, abrogate existing law and generally contrive ways to exploit legal ambiguities as a means to his ends. He has also

declared the Senate in recess when it was not, thereby bypassing the Senate's constitutional advice and consent role to install several partisans in top Federal posts. Today, this is glorified and glamorized as compassionate progressivism. The Framers called it 'despotism.'

Then here is what makes Mark's book so great. He goes right to the source and quotes "Federalist 48" by James Madison. Most people give more credit to Madison for the Constitution getting specifically written than other people, but Madison wrote:

An elective despotism was not the government we fought for but one which should not only be founded on free principles but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy as that no one could transcend their legal limits without being effectually checked and restrained by the others.

Mark Levin cites "Federalist 78" by Alexander Hamilton:

Whoever attentively considers the different departments of power must perceive that in a government in which they are separated from each other, the judiciary, from the nature of its functions, will always be the least dangerous to the political rights of the Constitution because it will be least in a capacity to annoy or injure them.

I mean this is the Founders saying that the Supreme Court that we must now all bow and scrape to as they rewrite the Constitution in their own image like some kind of gods on Mount Olympus, the Founders said they are the least dangerous because they are going to have the least power to "annoy or injure."

Levin goes on:

Yet having seized for itself in the early years of the Nation the final words on all matters before it, the Supreme Court, with just five of its nine members, can impose the most far-reaching and breathtaking rulings on the whole of society for which there is no recourse.

My copy of Mark's book is falling apart, but it is still good stuff.

He also says in "The Liberty Amendments":

What was to be a relatively innocuous Federal Government operating from a defined enumeration of specific grants of powers has become an ever-present and unaccountable force.

This is so scary, but Mark Levin puts it so well. He describes the Federal Government as the Nation's largest creditor, debtor, lender, employer, consumer, contractor, grantor, property owner, tenant, insurer, health care provider and pension guarantor. Moreover, with aggrandized police powers, what it does not control directly, it bans or mandates by regulation.

□ 1145

For example, the Federal Government regulates most things bathroom, laundry room, kitchen, as well as the mortgage you hold on your house. It designs your automobile and dictates the kind of fuel it uses. It regulates your baby's toys, crib, and stroller, plans your children's school curricula and lunch menu and administers their student loans in colleges.

At your place of employment, the Federal Government oversees everything from the racial gender and age diversity of the workforce, to the hours, wages, and benefits paid. Indeed, the question is not what the Federal Government regulates, but what it does not regulate. And it makes you wonder, how can a people, incapable of selecting their own light bulbs and toilets, possess enough confidence to vote for their own rulers and fill out complicated tax returns.

Mark also points out that the Federal Government consumes nearly 25 percent of all goods and services produced each year by the American people.

That should, if people will wake up, it should begin to scare them because if the Federal Government is the largest consumer, just on that alone, it has the power to bankrupt companies, to make companies. And then you start running into the horrible constitution that we rubber-stamped and may have helped put together over in Afghanistan, where they so centralized the power in the federal government that the President in Afghanistan gets to appoint governors, gets to appoint mayors, gets to appoint police chiefs, appoint the highest level of teachers, appoints many of the slate of part of the legislature, has tremendous power of the purse, and you wonder why that country is about to fall as soon as we pull out, when we were complicit in a constitution that on its face should have told people this government under this constitution is doomed to fail and fall back into Taliban hands, and that is exactly what is about to happen.

We should have known better than to help Afghanistan and be complicit in a constitution that does what our Founders said should never be done for a federal government. But when we have lost the lessons of our founding such that Congress allows power to be totally usurped by a Supreme Court or by an executive branch, and the American people do not rise up and condemn the comments by a leader in the Senate who says, What right does the House have to say how the money is spent?, that ought to be enough to have a recall election if a leader in the Senate doesn't even know why the House of Representatives is supposed to have an extremely loud voice in how the money is spent.

And, in fact, any bill that raises revenue must start in the House, which the same Senate leaders did not understand, or perhaps they understood and tried to tap dance around, but since the Supreme Court and Chief Justice Roberts rewrote ObamaCare, the un-Affordable Care Act, because it is certainly not affordable, it is costing so many people in my district, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, party doesn't matter when it comes to ObamaCare. Seniors that I visit with at retirement homes and communities are scared because they are realizing and they are finding out, gee, ObamaCare

cut \$716 billion from reimbursing health care providers for care we were going to get.

And they are starting to figure out even though they were assured, you don't have to worry, you are not going to be affected, you are not going to lose any health care because this is only cutting what we reimburse health care providers, seniors are smart folks. They have been around awhile, and they are figuring out, wait a minute, you cut \$700 million out of reimbursement for our health care providers with ObamaCare, really, and you think we are not going to figure out that that means we are not going to get the treatment we need. We are going to be told we don't have the knee replacement we need or the hip replacement we need because we are too old, or we get put on some list for an exorbitant amount of time which means you are hoping that we will die before we get the treatment we need, as often happens in England and Canada and other places with totally government-run health care.

Single payer, that is such a misnomer. It is government-run private lives. Instead of single payer, it is government. It is the GRE, government running everything. When the government can tell you what care you can have and not have, they control your life and they control how quickly your life will come to an end.

It is wrong. It is so against the foundation, the principles upon which we were founded.

My brilliant friend, Mark Levin said:

What was to be a relatively innocuous Federal Government, operating from a defined enumeration of specific agents of power, has become an ever-present and unaccountable force.

I want to reiterate that because the problem that we see repeatedly now is when someone presides over death of people entrusted to their care and protection, they can stand up and say, What difference at this point does it make? So they died. What difference does it make why they died, how they died?

A Libyan acquaintance a few weeks ago said, you guys in the United States, Congress in Washington, are asking the wrong question. Of course, personally, I think it is an appropriate question to ask: Who killed Ambassador Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, and our two former Navy SEALs? Who killed them? Who killed Ty Woods and Glen Doherty? Who blew off much of the leg of David Ubben?

I think it is a legitimate question, but this Libyan man I met said, You keep asking in America who killed these people. You ought to be asking why they were killed. Well, that is certainly an important question. And I know our former Secretary of State said, What difference at this point does it make? But I think this Libyan man is right. We need to be asking why were they killed. And it certainly wasn't about a video. And I know that we have

got some newspapers that are losing viewership or readership and so they are trying as best they can before people completely quit reading it to help their next candidate for President, I get that. I understand.

But the fact is these were radical Islamists, al Qaeda-related people in the group. There was never a demonstration. It was an attack from the very beginning, just as Chris Stevens called and Greg Hicks pointed out: we are under attack. There was no indication of a demonstration about some stupid video. They were under attack. It was predicted and talked about. Some in Egypt were saying if you don't release the blind sheikh who was implicit and in prison for the murder of New Yorkers as they tried in 1993 to bring down the World Trade Center, they were saying you have to start by releasing the blind sheikh or there is going to be violence. It wasn't about a video, for goodness sake.

When the government consumes 25 percent of everything produced in America, the government is too big. It needs to be reduced in size. Powers need to be returned to the States from which they were usurped. We need to give more power and control back to the local government. We have got people screaming about the minimum wage. It is outrageous for people in this town to tell somebody in San Augustine, Texas, what they have to pay, that they have to go to pay \$10 or \$15 for minimum wage. It is outrageous. Some places in the country, that may not be enough as the bottom line and isn't, and people are being paid more than that. But for teenagers, like I was when I started working, actually before I was a teenager I started working, but I started paying into Social Security, I guess, when I was 13 or 14, but minimum wage is a great place to start. When I went to work as an assistant district attorney for Titus, Camp, and Morris Counties, I was getting paid \$700 a month. It was what they could afford, and I was able to live at home and work for that and help those counties. The closer to the facts on the ground is the control of a government, then the better the government.

When the Federal Government here in Washington dictates school programs, school tests, it is just wrong. And this isn't an issue of Republican or Democrat. I had this discussion with President Bush's Secretary of Education because she was violating the Constitution because education is not an enumerated power within the Constitution. Therefore, under the 10th Amendment, it is reserved to the States and people.

She said if you liked what I was doing in Austin, you ought to love what I am doing in Washington. I said, No, when you were in Austin, you were acting within the confines of the Constitution. And now you are here in Washington, you are acting beyond the Constitution. You are mandating that people teach to a test. You got to go to

Gladewater, Texas, with me and go to a special needs school there where they got over 120 precious lives. And when one of them for a good day can touch something, point to something shiny, to have a Federal bureaucrat dictate the kind of test that needs to be given, or in Tyler at the St. Louis School where I met a young man, a special needs young man, and their goal for the end of the year was if he could put his fork in a piece of food and get it to his mouth, but because the Federal Government intervened, because they didn't know that special needs young man and because they didn't know the kids there in Gladewater there at that precious school, they dictate.

Now, the Secretary of Education said, Oh, but you can get an alternative test. And I said, Yeah, and you know what kind of alternative test got approved for that young man they were trying to teach to feed himself. They wouldn't approve him being able to feed himself. No, but they did approve if he would point to a sticker with food on it, he could pass his test. Thank you so much Federal Government. And that is what we have had with so many of these programs that were well intended.

You want to help a single mom, I want to help a single mom with a deadbeat dad not helping at all. But the best way to do it is not to lure them into a rut from which they cannot extricate themselves. The better policy is to help them get a high school diploma. They are better off with daycare than with a handout that encourages them to have more and more children out of wedlock. I am not blaming the single moms. I am blaming the Federal Government for creating a system that after 50 years has taken our nuclear homes that were the backbone of this country and gone from between 6 and 7 percent of children being born to a single mom in the sixties, and because of this government's well-intentioned, but ridiculously stupid, program, we now have over 40 percent of children being born to single moms, heading toward 50 percent.

□ 1200

It is wrongheaded when a government does not help.

I will tell you, I spent some precious time out at Texas College in Tyler, one of the oldest colleges in Texas. It was started as an African American college. I used to wonder, I am looking forward—as Martin Luther King, Jr. said—to the day when people are judged by the content of their character, not the color of their skin. I am looking forward to the day when race is not on a form anybody fills out because it doesn't matter; it doesn't make any difference. I am looking forward to that day.

But I have learned a lot from Texas College because I have seen young African Americans—repeatedly, I have met African Americans—who are the first in their family to go to college. It is a

great stepping off place. It is a great place to start, to break through that ceiling that has kept people in poverty.

I met with and visited with a combined sociology class some time ago and talked about this issue of the Federal Government wanting to help, but instead luring young single moms into holes they can't get out of. Many do, but many can't. I asked them for advice. There were single moms there. I was shocked with some of the suggestions they said. They said you need to have a drug test on aid for dependent children; you need to have a drug test on any kind of welfare; you need to have a work requirement on any kind of welfare.

That was a tough group.

They said you are not doing enough to push people to reach their potential.

Then when you meet and talk with single moms, African Americans, that got lured into a rut, and by the grace of God they are trying to get out of that. They are trying to get some college and improve themselves and reach their potential, but they feel like the government lured them into a rut now they are trying desperately to get out of. We owe them better. We owe them a system that doesn't lure them into holes but helps them reach for the sky.

Maybe it would have been better in the '60s to help with daycare if somebody has a child, a single mom has a child, because we know from study after study you've got a better chance of having a successful life if you finish high school. So why not have that as a goal instead of luring people into having more and more children.

The people that I had to face for felony welfare fraud, some may think it is a racial issue, but I saw it wasn't at all. Every race, creed, color, people got lured into this, and it was wrong. The government should not have systems that do that.

There is another profound statement that Mark Levin has in this book, "The Liberty Amendments." He points out:

The individual's liberty, inextricably linked to his private property, is submerged in the quicksand of a government that is aggregating authority and imploding simultaneously.

What then is the answer? Again, Alexis de Tocqueville offers guidance looking back at the Constitutional Convention some 50 years afterwards. He observed that:

It is a novelty in the history of society to see a great people turn a calm and scrutinizing eye upon itself, when apprised by the legislature that the wheels of its government are stopped, to see it carefully examine the extent of the evil, and patiently wait 2 whole years until a remedy is discovered, to which it voluntarily submitted without its costing a tear or a drop of blood from mankind.

It is a profound book. Levin quotes Madison in Federalist 14:

In the first place, it is to be remembered, that the general government is not to be charged with the whole power of making and administering laws: its jurisdiction is limited to certain enumerated objects, which concern all the members of the Republic, but

which are not to be attained by the separate provisions of any.

Then in Federalist 45, he insisted:

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite.

In Federalist 46, Madison asserted that:

The powers proposed to be lodged in the Federal Government are as little formidable to those reserved to the individual States, as they are indispensably necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Union; and that all those alarms which have been sounded, of a meditated and consequential annihilation of the State governments, must, on the most favorable interpretation, be ascribed to the chimerical fears of the authors of them.

This is a great book. There is just so much wonderful history from our United States history that deserves further looking. The library should have the book if people want to read it.

We are not thinking straight in this town, and there are negotiations ongoing with Iran about nuclear weapons, whose leaders have called us the "Great Satan" that needs to be destroyed, called Israel the "Little Satan" that needs to be destroyed, and they have missiles they can put nuclear weapons on top of Israel for its destruction creating a new holocaust, millions of lives could be lost. But as our friend Prime Minister Netanyahu points out, they are building and they have created intercontinental ballistic missiles.

He is trying to wake the United States up, Netanyahu is, when he is saying that they don't need those to take out Israel. They've got missiles to take us out. Those intercontinental ballistic missiles are for the United States they call the Great Satan. Its leaders believe that under their interpretation of prophecy from the Koran that the twelfth Imam, al-Mahdi, can emerge or will emerge from chaos. They believe that it could be nuclear chaos. So by creating nuclear bombs and setting them off, Israel, the United States, Little Satan, Great Satan, they can hasten the return of the twelfth Imam to rule over the global caliphate.

When somebody thinks that kind of thought, we need to make sure they don't get nukes, and we need to take out anything where they are producing nukes. We have the power and ability to do it. Everybody, including Russia and China, needs to understand, if we don't take them out, they could be launched at Russia and China, because they are led by infidels, to Iran's way of thinking, just like the U.S. and Israel are to their way of thinking.

So January 7, there is an article in TheBlaze, Sharona Schwartz. It says:

An Iranian official says that his country needs a nuclear bomb in order to "put Israel in its place."

"We don't aspire to obtain a nuclear bomb, but it is necessary so we can put Israel in its place."

Of course there are plenty of quotes from their leaders that the proper place for Israel is "wiped off the map."

"After arriving in New York"—the article points out "Rouhani"—the new President—"again was contacted at his hotel by an unspecified White House official."

And this is from a parliament member in Iran, Muhammad Nabavian:

"I assembled the delegation accompanying me and we decided not to meet with Obama. On Tuesday afternoon after the press conference, they said to me, 'why did you humiliate Obama in America?' and I said there was no humiliation. Here I recalled the words of Imam Khomeini who said that one must humiliate the infidel leaders," Nabavian reported about Rouhani's description of the events.

It is very important that the leaders in this country, including our President, realize that to these religious fanatic nuts he is an infidel leader, we are infidel leaders, and we are worthy of being humiliated, and as the leaders of the Great Satan we are worthy of being destroyed. That must be understood.

What has come about as radical Islamist—and I am very careful about that, despite what some of the more ignorant in the left wing would say in the left-wing media. We don't have to fear moderate Muslims. And I am talking about the kind of moderate Muslims that I have befriended in Egypt and Afghan, who are the enemy of my enemy, who are the enemy of the United States' enemy, who are the enemy of Israel, our ally.

We can work with them, just as is happening in Egypt right now where moderate Muslims were sickened by the Muslim Brotherhood's burning of churches, killing of Christians, persecution of Christians. That is something that former President Morsi is on trial for. And the interim President right now is a former judge, so we had some things in common as we spoke not long ago there in Egypt.

Yet, as the odds are getting stacked farther and higher against Israel's existence, and as we are demanding Israel give away more of its land as Palestinian leaders continue to say they are not agreeing to anything, they are not agreeing to Israel's right to even exist as a Jewish nation, as a place where Jews can avoid another holocaust like in World War II, they are not even willing to recognize that, how can there ever be peace? As I said personally to the Palestinian's former prime minister, how can you expect peace when you won't even recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish nation?

So they want Israel to keep giving away more and more land, and every time—going back to the very inception of Israel, 1,000, 1,600, 1,800 years before Muhammad was born, the actual founding of Israel, going back that early, any time Israel has given away land trying to buy peace, that land ultimately gets used as a staging area from which to attack it. They are about, I hope, to learn that lesson.

So what do we have going on here in the United States now? Well, Caroline Glick has a great article called: "Col-

umn One: The Left Against Zion." This is from December 19. She says:

This week has been a big one for the anti-Israel movement. In the space of a few days, two quasi-academic organizations—the American Studies Association and the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association—have launched boycotts against Israeli universities. Their boycotts follow a similar one announced in April by the Asian Studies Association.

These groups' actions have not taken place in isolation. They are of a piece with ever-escalating acts of anti-Israel agitation in college campuses throughout the United States.

□ 1215

I would interject that it is sickening and incredible to me to see anti-Semitism growing just the way it did before the 1930s and 1940s when over 6 million Jews were mercilessly, brutally killed—and we are seeing it arise. When I learned about the Holocaust and when I went to Germany, through what I had learned and read and seen, I could never have imagined. Thank God we could never have that happen during my lifetime. Now I am watching the seeds of anti-Semitism, of anti-Israel—of people wanting to wipe them off the map, of those who are proposing another Holocaust.

Then we have pseudo intellectual wannabes at universities where they no longer allow true diversity of thought and discussion that made them originally great, which allowed them originally to have liberals there get in charge, and now they cut off so often conservative speech. It used to be in universities, even as conservative as Texas A&M was when I was there, that we had many liberal speakers, and I enjoyed meeting and debating with some of them, with some of the greats in the country. Now, even at Texas A&M, they are careful not to invite people who are too conservative because you don't want to tick off the Faculty Senate. Like most universities, it has gotten very, very liberal.

In Caroline Glick's article she points out:

Every week brings a wealth of stories about new cases of aggressive anti-Israel activism. At the University of Michigan last week, thousands of students were sent fake eviction notices from the university's housing office. A pro-Palestinian group distributed them in dorms across campus to disseminate the blood libel that Israel is carrying out mass expulsions of Palestinians.

At Swarthmore College, leftist anti-Israel Jewish students who control Hillel are insisting on using Hillel's good offices to disseminate and legitimate anti-Israel slanders; and the left's doctrinaire insistence that Israel is the root of all evil is not limited to campuses.

At New York's 92nd Street Y, commentary editor John Podhoretz was booed and hissed by the audience for trying to explain why the ASA's just-announced boycott of Israel was an obscene act of bigotry.

It is a great article. I don't have time to read it all, but she points out:

This week, Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz retired after 50 years on the law faculty. His exit, the same week as the ASA

and the NAISA announced their boycotts of Israeli universities, symbolized the marginalization of the pro-Israel left that Dershowitz represented.

For years, Dershowitz has been a nonentity in leftist circles. His place at the table was usurped by anti-Israel Jews like Peter Beinart, and now Beinart is finding himself increasingly challenged by anti-Semitic Jews like Max Blumenthal.

The progression is unmistakable.

People need to wake up and understand that this kind of thing has all happened before, and when people don't recognize it, it happens again in history. God help us that it doesn't happen while our generation is in charge, but these growing acts of anti-Semitism, anti-Israel continue to progress by so-called "Progressives," making it seem as if this is another apartheid like in South Africa, which was so unfair, racially so wrong in South Africa. It got corrected. This is not the same thing at all. This is a group of people who have been persecuted throughout their history, having a country where they have a longer history of right to that area than any other people existing today.

Yet, as universities, the so-called "left" become more loud and more vocal in their hatred and anger, I have wondered: If Iran dropped a nuke on Jerusalem or Tel Aviv, if Iran killed a million Jews in Israel, have those leftists—those anti-Semitic, anti-Israel folks at universities—gotten so far from decency that they would applaud Israelis, Jews being killed by the millions in Israel? I wonder. I wonder if there would be any reaction like there has been in history, like there was in Germany when Jews were being killed? They deserved it. They were the problem in this country.

Rationalization is a great thing, and it is a dangerous thing.

People who were in Germany, who lived through the Holocaust don't want to talk about it because they cannot believe that they got sucked into that group dynamic that allowed them to be so inhuman and so callous that they didn't care about the extinction of Jews in Germany. I really don't know the answer. These anti-Israeli groups in universities like to think they are diverse, but yet they go after and destroy anybody who attempts to debate them. Would they cheer if Jews and Israelis were killed by Iran?

I hope they will wake up to what is happening at these universities, but here again, love and money can be the root of all evil, and we see universities across this country getting more and more money from Middle Eastern countries that say, Hey, by the way, you need to teach a course on Islamophobia or at least have a seminar, and talk about anybody who raises issues about radical Islam, like the author in The Washington Times, Husain, who just lied completely about things that I had said. He just lied. He made stuff up. He didn't do his homework. Yet those kinds of things are being talked about and taught at universities.

We have got to get back to having real debate. Some people think, when I get upset, it means I hate somebody. I don't. I come from a family where we fuss at each other tooth and nail. We still love each other and stand by each other. I heard that this was attributed to Johnson, as President, but we had a pastor in Mount Pleasant, Texas, in 1953, who said it to my parents: if two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary. The same is true here in Congress. If we all agree on everything, then all but one are unnecessary. We don't need a Congress. We don't need advisors. If one person knows everything, then just let him make all the decisions, but that is not the case in this fallen world. We need to hear from everybody. Debate is a good thing, and it used to be at universities and can be again if they will allow all voices to be heard.

I have one other story here from CNS News:

Afghanistan will resume being a terrorist haven when U.S. troops depart.

That is going to happen. I have been talking about that for a number of years, and it doesn't have to happen if we would simply grant the people of Afghanistan what the Founders originally gave us. We have messed it up, but they originally gave us a government where the States were the most powerful entity. As my moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan have said, and as former Vice President Massoud has said, and others: if you will just help us push Karzai to let us have an amendment in our constitution that allows us to elect our governors, elect our mayors, get our own police chiefs, govern our own regions, our own state areas—if you will let us do that, we can keep the Taliban out.

I mentioned it before, but when I asked, "What makes you think we could exert that kind of pressure?" they informed me that out of about a \$12.5 billion government budget in Afghanistan, the Afghans only provide about \$1.5 billion. The rest is provided by foreign countries, and most of that is the United States. Today, if this President says you either let the states elect their own governors and mayors and pick their own police chiefs—that is today—or we will cut off every dime going to Afghanistan, I would bet that would be the day they would get started and that they would get an amendment to their constitution, and they would become more of a democratic republic like we started out as, perhaps even more than we are now.

We need to do that for them. We don't need to let more American lives be killed and be taken in Afghanistan. That doesn't have to happen. It didn't have to happen. Even though Secretary Gates said that he didn't believe the President was really convinced the surge was a good idea in Afghanistan, he still sent more troops, and what people haven't been talking about for a long time is that 75 percent of the people of the American soldiers who have

been killed in Afghanistan—soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen—all of them—have been killed while President Obama has been Commander in Chief.

I did not think President Bush did the right thing by sending tens of thousands of American troops in after the Taliban was defeated with fewer than 500 Americans in supporting the Northern Alliance, but we became occupiers. It was a mistake by the Bush administration, I believe, and then a mistake that President Obama inherited, and it got worse. We don't have to leave and have the blood of our soldiers—of our military—cry out as we leave Afghanistan and as the Taliban takes back over. Let us, Madam Speaker, help Afghanistan to root out the evil in its own country. Let's help them get a constitution that let's them root it out for themselves. That is how we should be doing foreign policy.

May God awaken the universities that were once so diverse and so great to understanding that they should not, cannot—I hope and pray do not—continue to foster this anti-Semitism, this anti-Israeli sentiment, that is growing, that might someday cheer when Israelis are nuked.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AUTONOMY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, Congress has a lot on its plate, and it is trying its best to pursue it. I am pleased to hear that we may be close to an agreement on the budget, but with all we have to do with respect to the economy, the environment, income inequality, and unemployment insurance, I think the public would be concerned when the Congress goes off course and no longer involves itself only in the Nation's business but interferes with the business of local jurisdictions. One of the cardinal principles of our Nation is, of course, what is local is local and not for the Federal Government.

This afternoon, I want to speak about three issues where the Nation has been drawn into local affairs by the Congress, much against the bipartisan principles on both sides of this Chamber and of the Senate as well. One issue involved the shutdown of a local government. Another involved something, perhaps, even more sacred: the autonomy every local government demands over its local funds and, only yesterday, the near-sacred autonomy over the local laws of a local jurisdiction.

Yesterday, there was a hearing. I would not have objected to the hearing. It was about a very controversial subject, and I happened to be on the other side of the majority, but it is a subject

that divides the Nation, and it deserves to be aired. It had to do with what looked to be re-codifying and, perhaps, also adding some provisions on reproductive choice by Members of the majority who oppose abortion in all of its forms, as do many of the American people.

□ 1230

Of course, we have a Supreme Court decision that has ruled on abortion. Nevertheless, there continues to be legislation and interest in this issue here.

Yesterday's hearing was a little curious because, for the most part, the issues have long been addressed by the Congress in appropriations bills. Nobody talks about the so-called Hyde amendment anymore because that has to do with Federal funds for access to abortion. That is no longer much contested.

There is a so-called Helms amendment, which denies access to safe abortion care with U.S.-paid funds in other parts of the world; codifying that. There were some add-ons that you typically might expect from the subcommittee for the Affordable Care Act; to make sure that federal civil servants and the military do not have access to abortion, etc.

I went to the hearing. Frankly, I found it very interesting, the press was interested in only—at least as I read this morning—largely interested in only one matter. That had to do with my request to testify on what was really a minor section of this bill. It was very important to us, but very minor in the bill.

It is a section that would codify something, again, that the appropriators already have done, that is, to keep D.C. from spending its own local funds on abortions for low-income women.

Remember, I just said the Hyde amendment keeps us from spending Federal funds. Note that I am talking only about local funds. In case you think we are an outlier here, 17 States provide local funds for abortions for their poor women because states and localities cannot spend Federal funds. We only want what they have. Those 17 States, by the way, include Alaska, Arizona, Montana—and I won't go on, but you can see that they may be States of various political views that simply don't want low-income women to be left out of the reproductive choice guaranteed by the Supreme Court's decision regarding abortion.

What the press was most interested in was not the major portions of the bill but the fact that Chairman TRENT FRANKS included a D.C. provision in his bill, a provision that says though these are D.C.'s local funds—\$8 billion, we are proud to say—raised by local taxpayers, our businesses and our residents, 100 percent of it local funds—that we, and we alone, in the United States must accept the dictates from the Congress of the United States about where we may spend our own